

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

STATE OF OREGON,

Civil No. 08-844-HU

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

DOUGLAS L. HADSELL,

Defendant.

MARSH, Judge.

Magistrate Judge Dennis James Hubel filed his Findings and Recommendation on August 15, 2008. The matter is now before me pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). When either party objects to any portion of the Magistrate's Findings and Recommendation, the district court must make a *de novo* determination of that portion of the Magistrate's report. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Business Machines, Inc., 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982).

Any objection was originally due on September 2, 2008. On

that date, defendant filed a motion for extension of time to file an objection. The motion was granted and the time for filing an objection was extended to September 19, 2008. Thereafter, defendant did not seek a further extension, but filed an objection to the Findings and Recommendation on September 30, 2008.

Timely objections have not been filed. I therefore review only the legal principles *de novo*.

I find no error. Accordingly, I ADOPT the Findings and Recommendation #3 of Magistrate Judge Hubel. This case is remanded to the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon for the County of Multnomah.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 3 day of October, 2008.

/s/ Malcolm F. Marsh
Malcolm F. Marsh
United States District Judge